

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Application No.: 10/584,143

Attorney Docket No.: Q94764

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 2 are currently pending in the application.

Claim Objection

The Examiner asserts that the term “CCD” in claim 2 should be spelled out. In response, Applicants have amended claim 2 to recite a “Charged Coupled Device (CCD)”. Accordingly, the objection is believed to be overcome.

Claim Rejections

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9245880 (“JP ‘880”) in view of France et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,672,900). Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner acknowledges that JP ‘880 lacks a seal member holder as recited in claim 1.¹ The Examiner attempts to correct this deficiency of JP ‘880 with France. However, even if it were appropriate to modify JP ‘880 with France as suggested by the Examiner, the combination would still be deficient with respect to the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites that “the seal member holder has an annular groove which receives the annular lip portion of the seal member so as to support the inner peripheral surface and the outer peripheral surface of the annular lip portion when the seal member holder is fitted on the connector portion.” In contrast, the alleged seal member holder in France lacks such a feature. Rather, the element (unlabeled) of the cap 66 in France which receives the nose portion 122 is not annular. Accordingly cap 66 element does not support the inner and outer peripheral surfaces, as

¹ At one point the Office Action states that JP ‘880 shows a “seal member holder 3”. However, it is believed that the inclusion of the term “holder” was a mistake and that the Examiner intended to state that JP ‘880 shows a seal member 3 as JP ‘880 does not identify element 3 as a seal member holder and the Examiner’s acknowledgement that JP ‘880 lacks a seal holder or seal member holder.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111

Application No.: 10/584,143

Attorney Docket No.: Q94764

claimed. Therefore, even if it were appropriate to modify JP '880 with France as suggested by the Examiner, the combination would still be deficient with respect to the claimed invention.

In view of the above, claim 1 is allowable over the combination of JP '880 and France and claim 2 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Stephen R. Valancius
Registration No. 57,574

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 7, 2007